

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Hatent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. 80x 1450 Algrandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,875	09/29/2003	Mahesh J. Deshmane	42P17507	6817
8791	7590 01/31/2006		EXAMINER	
	SOKOLOFF TAYLOR &	SUGENT,	SUGENT, JAMES F	
	12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER
~_ ·· ·	LES, CA 90025-1030		2116	
			DATE MAILED: 01/31/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/675,875	DESHMANE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		James Sugent	2116			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABANI	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29.5	September 2003.				
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowa		, prosecution as to the merits is			
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)	4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.					
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.					
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 September 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
,	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2)  Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

20

25

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Objections

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: reads "...over a bus via the memory controller,..." but fails to previously mention a said memory controller. Change to read "...over a bus via a memory controller,...". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Ware et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054845 A1) (hereinafter referred to as Ware).

As to claim 1, Ware discloses a computer system comprising: a bus (DQ line in figure 36); and a chipset (driver circuit in figure 36 exemplified by 3608; paragraph 332, lines 8-26), coupled to the bus, to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over the bus via the chipset, and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61).

As to **claim 10**, Donnelly discloses a computer system wherein the bus is a high-speed bus (Donnelly discloses a memory system wherein high performance is maintained; paragraph 55).

As to **claim 11**, Ware discloses a computer memory system comprising: a main memory device (3602); a memory bus (line DQ) coupled to the main memory device (3602); and a memory controller (3601 containing bus driver circuit exemplified by 3608 in figure 36),

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

25

coupled to the bus, to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over the bus, and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61 and paragraph 332, lines 8-26).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 12-14, 18 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ware et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054845 A1) (hereinafter referred to as Ware) and Donnelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,481) (hereinafter referred to as Donnelly).

As to **claim 2**, Ware discloses a computer memory system wherein the chipset (driver circuit in figure 36 exemplified by 3608; paragraph 332, lines 8-26) to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over the bus via the chipset, and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61).

Ware fails to disclose the chipset comprising: a slew rate detection mechanism to detect the slew rate and generate a signal to indicate the status of the slew rate; and control logic, coupled to the slew rate detection mechanism, to receive the signal and modify the slew rate based upon the signal.

5

10

15

Donnelly teaches a bus driver circuit (200) having slew rate control wherein said driver circuit comprises: a slew rate detection mechanism (230) to detect the slew rate and generate a signal to indicate the status of the slew rate (column 4, lines 44-51); and control logic (260), coupled to the slew rate detection mechanism, to receive the signal and modify the slew rate based upon the signal (column 4, lines 18-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware and Donnelly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the bus driver circuit disclosed by Ware to use the slew detection and control circuitry as taught by Donnelly.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of bus driver circuit in view of the teachings of Donnelly, as doing so would give the added benefit of having the slew circuits manufactured on the same substrate as surrounding circuit therefore enabling the slew circuitry to track and compensate slew variations as they occur (column 3, lines 50-67).

As to **claim 3**, Ware discloses a computer memory system wherein the chipset (driver circuit in figure 36 exemplified by 3608; paragraph 332, lines 8-26) to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over the bus via the chipset, and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61).

Ware fails to disclose the system chipset further comprises an input/output (I/O) buffer coupled to the control logic.

Donnelly teaches a bus driver circuit (200) having slew rate control wherein said driver circuit comprises an I/O buffer (220; column 6, lines 17-21).

5

10

15

20

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware and Donnelly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the bus driver circuit disclosed by Ware to include an I/O buffer as taught by Donnelly.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of bus driver circuit in view of the teachings of Donnelly, as doing so would give the added benefit of having the slew circuits manufactured on the same substrate as surrounding circuit therefore enabling the slew circuitry to track and compensate slew variations as they occur (column 3, lines 50-67).

As to **claim 4**, Donnelly teaches a bus driver to a computer system wherein the control logic reduces the slew rate if the signal received from the slew rate detection mechanism indicates that the slew rate is too fast (column 4, lines 18-27).

As to **claim 5**, Donnelly teaches a bus driver to a computer system wherein the control logic increases the slew rate if the signal received from the slew rate detection mechanism indicates that the slew rate is too slow (column 5, lines 3-13).

As to **claim 12**, Ware discloses a computer memory system wherein the memory controller (3601 containing bus driver circuit exemplified by 3608 in figure 36), coupled to the bus, to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over the bus, and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61 and paragraph 332, lines 8-26).

Ware fails to disclose a the memory controller comprising: a slew rate detection mechanism to detect the slew rate and generate a signal to indicate the status of the slew rate; and control logic, coupled to the slew rate detection mechanism, to receive the signal and modify the slew rate based upon the signal.

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

Donnelly teaches a bus driver circuit (200) having slew rate control wherein said driver circuit comprises: a slew rate detection mechanism (230) to detect the slew rate and generate a signal to indicate the status of the slew rate (column 4, lines 44-51); and control logic (260), coupled to the slew rate detection mechanism, to receive the signal and modify the slew rate based upon the signal (column 4, lines 18-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware and Donnelly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the bus driver circuit disclosed by Ware to use the slew detection and control circuitry as taught by Donnelly.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of bus driver circuit in view of the teachings of Donnelly, as doing so would give the added benefit of having the slew circuits manufactured on the same substrate as surrounding circuit therefore enabling the slew circuitry to track and compensate slew variations as they occur (column 3, lines 50-67).

As to **claim 13**, Donnelly teaches a system wherein the control logic reduces the slew rate if the signal received from the slew rate detection mechanism indicates that the slew rate is too fast (column 4, lines 18-27).

As to **claim 14**, Donnelly teaches a system wherein the control logic increases the slew rate if the signal received from the slew rate detection mechanism indicates that the slew rate is too slow (column 5, lines 3-13).

As to **claim 18**, Ware discloses a method comprising: transmitting a signal from within a chipset (memory controller 3601 comprising a driver circuit in figure 36 exemplified by 3608; paragraph 332, lines 8-26) over a bus (via 3620) and adjusting the slew rate at control logic within the chipset based upon the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61).

Application/Control Number: 10/675,875

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

Ware fails to disclose transmitting a signal from an input/output (I/O) buffer over a bus; receiving the signal at a slew rate detection mechanism within the chipset via the bus; and generating a signal indicating the status of the slew rate.

Donnelly teaches a bus driver circuit (200) comprising an I/O buffer (220; column 6, lines 17-21), receiving the signal at a slew rate detection mechanism and generating a signal indicating the status of the slew rate (230; column 4, lines 44-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware and Donnelly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the bus driver circuit disclosed by Ware to use the slew detection method and I/O buffer as taught by Donnelly.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of bus driver method in view of the teachings of Donnelly, as doing so would give the added benefit of having the slew circuits manufactured on the same substrate as surrounding circuit therefore enabling the slew circuitry to track and compensate slew variations as they occur (column 3, lines 50-67).

As to claim 21, Donnelly discloses a method wherein adjusting the slew rate comprises modifying the amplification of a second signal at the I/O buffer (receive a drive signal; column 4, line 6-17).

As to **claim 22**, Ware discloses an apparatus comprising: a slew rate detection mechanism (driver circuit in figure 36 exemplified by 3608; paragraph 332, lines 8-26) to detect the slew rate of a signal transmitted over a bus (line DQ) via a memory controller (3601), and to adjust the slew rate based upon the state of the signal (paragraphs 55 and 61).

Ware fails to disclose a mechanism to generate a signal based upon the signal status.

Application/Control Number: 10/675,875 Page 8

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

Donnelly teaches a bus driver method (200) comprising detecting the slew rate signal at the detection mechanism (230) and generating a signal indicating the status of the slew rate (column 4, lines 44-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware and Donnelly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the bus driver circuit disclosed by Ware to use the slew detection and notification method and as taught by Donnelly.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of bus driver method in view of the teachings of Donnelly, as doing so would give the added benefit of having the slew circuits manufactured on the same substrate as surrounding circuit therefore enabling the slew circuitry to track and compensate slew variations as they occur (column 3, lines 50-67).

As to **claim 23**, Donnelly teaches an apparatus wherein the slew rate detection mechanism generates a signal to indicate the status of the slew rate bus (drive signal; column 4, line 6-17).

As to **claim 24**, Donnelly teaches an apparatus further comprising control logic (260; column 4, lines 18-22), coupled to the slew rate detection (230) mechanism, to receive the signal and modify the slew rate based upon the signal (column 3, line 50 thru column 4, line 6).

As to **claim 25**, Donnelly teaches an apparatus further comprising an input/output (I/O) buffer (220) coupled to the control logic (column 6, lines 17-21).

Claims 6, 9, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ware et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054845 A1) (hereinafter referred to as Ware) and

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

Donnelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,481) (hereinafter referred to as Donnelly) as applied to claims 2, 12, 18 and 22 above, and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,285 B2) (hereinafter referred to as Lee).

As to **claim 6**, Ware and Donnelly fail to teach the slew detection mechanism to include a capacitor to integrate the received signal current.

Lee teaches an integrator circuit (figure 2) to include a capacitor (Cin) to integrate the received current on an input terminal (Vin) (Lee teaches the integrator circuit being capable of repairing slew on the signal line; column 4, lines 38-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware, Donnelly and Lee before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the slew detector circuit disclosed by Ware and Donnelly to use the integrator circuit containing a capacitor with slew detection and repair method and as taught by Lee.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of slew detection circuit in view of the teachings of Lee, as doing so would give the added benefit of achieving low distortion and noise with minimal power consumption (column 2, lines 40-45).

As to **claim 9**, Donnelly teaches the computer system wherein the comparator (410) is an operational amplifier (column 6, lines 29-31).

As to **claim 15**, Ware and Donnelly fail to teach the slew detection mechanism to include a capacitor to integrate the received signal current.

Lee teaches an integrator circuit (figure 2) to include a capacitor (Cin) to integrate the received current on an input terminal (Vin) (Lee teaches the integrator circuit being capable of repairing slew on the signal line; column 4, lines 38-48).

Application/Control Number: 10/675,875 Page 10

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware, Donnelly and Lee before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the slew detector circuit disclosed by Ware and Donnelly to use the integrator circuit containing a capacitor with slew detection and repair method and as taught by Lee.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of slew detection circuit in view of the teachings of Lee, as doing so would give the added benefit of achieving low distortion and noise with minimal power consumption (column 2, lines 40-45).

As to **claim 26**, Ware and Donnelly fail to teach the slew detection mechanism to include a capacitor to integrate the received signal current.

Lee teaches an integrator circuit (figure 2) to include a capacitor (Cin) to integrate the received current on an input terminal (Vin) (Lee teaches the integrator circuit being capable of repairing slew on the signal line; column 4, lines 38-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware, Donnelly and Lee before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the slew detector circuit disclosed by Ware and Donnelly to use the integrator circuit containing a capacitor with slew detection and repair method and as taught by Lee.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of slew detection circuit in view of the teachings of Lee, as doing so would give the added benefit of achieving low distortion and noise with minimal power consumption (column 2, lines 40-45).

Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 19, 20, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ware et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054845 A1) (hereinafter

Application/Control Number: 10/675,875

Art Unit: 2116

5

10

15

20

referred to as Ware), Donnelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,481) (hereinafter referred to as Donnelly) and Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,285 B2) (hereinafter referred to as Lee) as applied to claims 6, 15 and 26 above, and further in view of Namiki (U.S. Patent No. 4,704,642) (hereinafter referred to as Namiki).

As to claims 7, 16, 19 and 27, Ware, Donnelly and Lee fail to teach the slew detector mechanism further includes: a reference current generator to generate a reference current; and a comparator to compare the received signal current to the reference current.

Namiki teaches a slew detection circuit (47) comprising a variable resistor that provides a variable voltage reference for comparator (56) wherein the reference delivered is dependent on the slew (column 12, lines 12-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, having the teachings of Ware, Donnelly, Lee and Namiki before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the reference to the comparator within the slew detector as disclosed by Ware, Donnelly and Lee to use the variable reference generator as taught by Namiki. Those skilled in the art should know that the relationship between voltage and current are directly proportionate such that V=iR via Ohm's Law. Therefore, given that the invention is claiming a current reference, it is a moot argument to provide this exact mechanism as voltage levels will provide the same action.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of comparator reference generator in view of the teachings of Namiki, as doing so would given the added benefit of noise reduction in addition to slew repairing (column 3, lines 30-46).

As to claims 8, 17, 20 and 28, Lee teaches the slew rate detection mechanism further includes: a first converter, coupled to the capacitor and the comparator to convert the signal

Application/Control Number: 10/675,875 Page 12

Art Unit: 2116

current to a signal voltage; and a second converter, coupled to the reference current generator and the comparator to convert the reference to a reference voltage (As argued above in claims 7,

16 and 27. Lee provides a voltage reference generator thus providing a voltage to the comparator

already; column 12, lines 12-30).

5

10

15

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sugent whose telephone number is (571) 272-5726. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

20

James Sugent
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2116
January 19, 2006

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100